DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 285 JC 890 009

TITLE Progress in Implementing the Recommendations of the Commission's 1987 Report on Strengthening Transfer and Articulation. A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission. Commission Report 88-38.

INSTITUTION California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.

PUB DATE Oct 88

NOTE 38p.; For the 1987 report on Strengthening Transfer and Articulation, see ED 293 602.

AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 Twelfth St., Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Education); College Admission; College Faculty; College Role; College Transfer Students; *Community Colleges; Curriculum Development; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Organizational Objectives; *Policy Formation; Remedial Instruction; State Legislation; State Universities; *Statewide Planning; Success; *Transfer Policy

IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

In November 1987, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) approved 11 recommendations on transfer, articulation, and collaboration between community colleges and four-year institutions. This report reviews efforts made by the California Community Colleges, the California State University (CSU), and the University of California (UC) to implement the recommendations. Section 1 provides background on CPEC's interest in and actions concerning transfer rates as well as on the development of the 1987 recommendations. Section 2 reviews the implementation of recommendations concerning the state's role; mandated/statewide versus voluntary/localized articulation; faculty roles; admission with advanced standing; assessment and remediation; databases and information systems; and articulated career programs. Section 3 presents conclusions, including that the UC and CSU are moving in directions and at a pace that are in accordance with CPEC's intent, while the community colleges, in part due to funding problems, are making slow progress. Appendixes detail CSU procedures for submitting proposals for new degree major programs and common core transfer curriculum documents. (AJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302285

STAFF REPORT SERIES

PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION'S 1987 REPORT ON STRENGTHENING TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Testa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

JC 890 009

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Executive Summary

In November 1987, the Commission approved 11 recommendations on transfer, articulation, and collaboration between community colleges and four-year institutions when it adopted its report, *Strengthening Transfer and Articulation Policies and Practices in California's Colleges and Universities*.

This current report reproduces those recommendations and quotes officials of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council, the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California regarding actions they have been taking during this past year to implement the recommendations that were addressed to them. It also contains Commission staff comments on these responses, suggestions about future actions regarding these recommendations, and a brief description of two recent developments that have implications for improving transfer.

The Policy Development Committee of the Commission discussed this report on October 31, 1988. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Library of the Commission at (916) 322-8031. Questions about the substance of the report may be directed to Dorothy M. Knoell of the Commission staff at (916) 322-8015.

PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION'S 1987 REPORT ON STRENGTHENING TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION

A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

COMMISSION REPORT 88-38
PUBLISHED OCTOBER 1988

THIS is one in a series of staff reports on important issues affecting California postsecondary education. These reports are brought to the California Postsecondary Education Commission for discussion rather than for action, and they represent the interpretation of the staff rather than the formal position of the Commission as expressed in its adopted resolutions and reports containing policy recommendations.

Like other publications of the Commission, this report is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 88-38 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

1. Background for the Report 1

Overview of the Report 1

Predecessors of the Report 1

Purposes and Organization of the Report 2

2. Past Commission Recommendations and Their Implementation 3

Recommendations About the State's Role 3

Mandated/Statewide Versus Voluntary/Localized Articulation 5

Faculty Roles 7

Admission with Advanced Standing 7

Data Bases and Information Systems 10

3. Conclusions 13

Conclusions Regarding the Universities 13

Conclusions Regarding the Community Colleges 13

Conclusions Regarding the Governor and the Legislature 13

Conclusions Regarding Other Groups 14

Emerging Issues 14

Appendix A: California State University Procedures for Submitting Proposals for New Degree Major Programs 17

Appendix B: Common Core Transfer Curriculum Documents 23

Bibliography 33

1 *Background for the Report*

Overview of the report

This is the second Commission report that reviews the status of statewide efforts to implement the Commission's major recommendations regarding transfer. The Commission with this report does not dismiss as fully implemented its previous recommendations, but commends the segments for the actions they have taken individually and collectively to address the issue of transfer. The report provides evidence for all three public segments in implementing the Commission's previous recommendations. In addition, the recently enacted Community College reform bill reiterates support for the transfer function as a high priority by naming it and vocational education as the two primary missions of the Community Colleges. The call for the development of the common core curriculum, as well as the changing landscape of University admissions requirements, all mean that intersegmental attention to transfer issues will need to be a continuing effort. The report identifies two emerging issues related to transfer -- the common core curriculum that faculties are now developing and the possibility of a jointly awarded associate in arts degree -- that require future intersegmental attention.

A complete report on Community College transfer trends that includes data for the 1987-88 year will be presented to the Commission in March 1989.

Predecessors of the report

Student access and flow into and among California institutions of higher education has been the subject of continuing interest on the part of the Commission since its inception in 1974. The Commission's early monitoring of college-going rates and Community College transfer statistics that began in 1978 with the establishment of its computerized student information system eventually led to questions about (1) reasons for an apparent decline in the number of Community College students who transferred to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions in the late 1970s and (2) what the decline might indicate about issues of quality.

In December 1983, the Chair of the Commission appointed nine Commissioners to an Ad Hoc Committee on Community College Transfer. He charged it to assess the condition of transfer and articulation and to make recommendations regarding ways to strengthen the function in California's colleges and universities. The Committee met for a full year, during which time it received extensive testimony from the field. In March 1985, the Commission adopted and published the Committee's final report, *Reaffirming California's Commitment to Transfer: Recommendations for Aiding Student Transfer from the California Community Colleges to the University of California and the California State University*.

That report included 24 specific recommendations in the areas of high school preparation for college, assessment and counseling of potential transfer students, assuring adequate transfer course offerings in the Community Colleges, improvement of transfer information for use by students and their advisors, and the coordination of transfer enrollment planning. Most of the recommendations were made to the Community Colleges, the University, and the State University.

In November 1987, following the staff's completion of a national study of transfer and articulation, the Commission adopted and published its report, *Strengthening Transfer and Articulation Policies and Practices in California's Colleges and Universities* (1987b), on how those 24 recommendations were being implemented. That report also included a section on implications of the national study for State, segmental, and institutional policies and practices in California, and a set of 11 recommendations in the areas of (1) the State's role, (2) mandated statewide versus voluntary localized articulation, (3) faculty roles, (4) admission with advanced standing, (5) assessment and remediation, (6) data bases and information systems, and (7) articulated career programs. Those recommendations were not intended to replace those in the earlier report but, instead, to

2update them and add to them, as appropriate in light of the implications of the national study for California.

Purposes and organization of the report

As in the case of its predecessor, the primary purpose of this report is to describe and assess what the segments and others have been doing during the past year to implement the Commission's most recent recommendations regarding transfer and articulation, and to update or revise its recommendations as needed in light of changing circumstances.

Part Two of the report (1) repeats the 11 recommendations that the Commission adopted in November 1987, (2) presents the segments' comments on what they have been doing to implement the recommendations that were addressed to them, and (3) comments on these actions and what they imply for the future. Part Three summarizes those findings and discusses the emerging issues of the common core curriculum and the possibility of a jointly awarded associate in arts degree for transfer.

2 Past Commission Recommendations and Their Implementation

THE Commission's report on *Strengthening Transfer and Articulation Policies and Practices* contained 11 recommendations that were addressed for the most part to the three public segments of California postsecondary education. Some were repeated from among the 24 recommendations that appeared in the Commission's earlier report on *Reaffirming California's Commitment to Transfer* (1986), while others were new recommendations that grew out of the Commission's national study of transfer, articulation, and collaboration that was funded by the Ford Foundation (1987a).

The smaller number of recommendations in the most recent report represents the elimination of some that appeared earlier because (1) substantial progress had been made in implementing the recommendation or (2) the recommendation was no longer appropriate or important. In a few instances, specific recommendations were combined to address a more general problem.

In preparing this report, staff asked the segments for information about their progress in implementing the Commission's most recent 11 recommendations during the past year. These recommendations appear below, followed by the information that the segments provided and by Commission staff comments on the status of the recommendations. In instances where recommendations were not addressed to one or more of the segments, staff used other sources of information to assess how implementation was taking place.

Recommendations about the State's role

RECOMMENDATION 1: The Governor and the Legislature should give broad policy direction to the segments in matters relating to the flow of students from secondary schools through California's colleges and universities to the baccalaureate degree, including the use of Community Colleges for students with such degree objectives.

The Legislature should also request whatever periodic and special reports are necessary to assure that its policies, priorities, and intentions are working satisfactorily to make the best use of the State's resources while promoting student access and retention.

In doing so, the Governor and the Legislature should recognize the cost of offering comprehensive, high quality transfer education programs as they take actions to change the basis on which Community Colleges are funded and, in addition, should continue their recent practice of providing special funding for pilot projects to improve transfer and articulation that cannot be readily funded from existing funding sources.

Commission staff comments

This recommendation stemmed from findings and conclusions of the Commission staff's national study of transfer and articulation that found that state statutes and regulations tend to be either unenforceable at the campus level or ineffective in carrying out the intent of the body that adopted them.

The Governor and the Legislature have now given broad policy direction to the segments in regard to transfer and articulation through the enactment of Assembly Bill 1725 (Vasconcellos, principal co-author; *Education Code* Chapter 973, Statutes of 1988), that implements the work of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education and the Legislature's Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan. In addition to designating transfer education as a primary mission of the Community Colleges -- the other being vocational education -- the statute calls for :

1. Development of a core transfer curriculum to fulfill the lower-division general education require-

ments of the University and the State University, with the proviso that any Community College student who completes that curriculum will have satisfied all lower-division general education requirements for both systems; and

2. Joint development and maintenance -- with the State Board of Education and the State University Trustees -- of articulated vocational education programs (2+2+2) leading to the baccalaureate degree.

The statute requires the Board of Governors to develop and implement a system of educational and fiscal accountability for the Colleges, including annual evaluations and reports on their effectiveness according to outcome measures that are developed cooperatively with the districts.

In regard to funding, the new statute extends the current statutory finance mechanism for the Community Colleges through fiscal year 1990-91, while calling upon the Board of Governors to develop and implement a mechanism for a program-based funding system through a three-year process.

In 1988, the Governor and the Legislature also appropriated additional funds for the following activities as requested in intersegmental budget change proposals.

1. Transfer centers on selected campuses in all segments;
2. Expansion of the California Articulation Number (CAN) system;
3. Continuation of funding for ASSIST (Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer); and
4. Pilot articulated career education programs (2+2+2) involving secondary schools, Community Colleges, the State University, and the University.

Thus, in a time of both (1) fundamental reforms that are to take place in the Community Colleges under AB 1725 and (2) an unexpected State revenue shortfall, the Governor and the Legislature in 1988 have acted in ways that are consonant with the Commission's first recommendation regarding broad policy direction, accountability, and funding.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The Intersegmental Coordinating Council should continue to function as a forum for discussion of and a source of information about transfer and articulation between and among colleges and universities while encouraging full participation by the secondary school segments.

The new Council should be responsible for keeping track of both voluntary and ratified course and program articulation agreements and for reporting to segmental administrators on the status of such agreements with respect to their ratification, recency of adoption, and potential for statewide segmental policy.

Response by the executive director of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council

"Since the adoption of the CPEC recommendation, the Council has sponsored a major statewide conference, bringing together faculty and administrative leaders from all five educational segments to discuss articulation in its broadest sense, including intersegmental approaches to outreach and student preparation, the improvement of teaching, and curriculum and assessment.

"The Council has also established the Transfer and Articulation Coordinating Committee to serve as a forum for discussion and a source of information on issues related to transfer and articulation. This intersegmental committee has assumed responsibility for publishing a yearly directory of transfer and articulation personnel, which is distributed to high schools, colleges and universities throughout the state. In addition, the Committee plans to update and republish the *Handbook of Articulation Policies and Procedures*, developed two years ago by the former Articulation Council, and to study the adequacy of publications and other forms of information currently available to potential transfer students. The committee also proposes to develop a statement on articulation principles, as the first step; in an effort to create a comprehensive plan for articulation in California education. Such a plan would identify the full complement of activities, programs, and resources currently devoted to articulation, identify areas of unmet needs, and design and promote efforts required to fill those needs. Other planned activities

include two regional conferences on articulation, a review of minority transfer programs, and the consideration of three different projects aimed at strengthening academic counseling in the high schools.

"The tracking of course and program articulation agreements is being accomplished through the California Articulation Number (CAN) system and Project. These efforts are both within the purview of the Transfer and Articulation Committee, and both are strongly supported by that committee. In their present state of development, these two systems are not capable of providing comprehensive information on the many thousands of course and program articulation agreements which now exist. However, the systems have the potential for providing that information and also of making the information more meaningful by simplifying the great variety of formats in which these agreements occur. The Transfer and Articulation Committee will work with these two projects and with the segments to simplify articulation, to extend it where necessary, and to make information on articulation more accessible. The committee will also assist in whatever ways possible with the development of broader articulation efforts, such as the transfer general education curriculum devised by the Academic Senates."

Commission staff comments

The Intersegmental Coordinating Council is a relatively new, voluntary organization involving both secondary schools and the various segments of California higher education. It appears to be moving in directions that are outlined in Recommendation 2, including the assumption of responsibility for the oversight of the California Articulation Number (CAN) system. The extent to which it is able to perform the specific articulation services that are suggested in Recommendation 2 will depend in part on future levels and sources of funding, since the Council does not now receive any direct appropriation from the State.

Mandated/statewide versus voluntary/localized articulation

RECOMMENDATION 3: The Community Colleges, the State University, and the University should encourage their respective campuses to work with nearby public and private colleges and universities to reach voluntary agreements that govern both the flow of students and the articulation of courses and programs.

The Community College response

"The regional approach to issues of transfer and articulation have been acknowledged as a productive approach. Regional articulation is being promoted through the 2+2+2 Programs, the 2+2 Program, through regional groupings for the implementation of Project ASSIST and the Transfer Centers, and through highlighting regional programs in statewide conferences. Community colleges are also being encouraged to develop transfer admission agreements with their local colleges."

The California State University response

"Most CSU campuses have effective articulation arrangements with their service area community colleges. In recent years, CSU's involvement with Transfer Centers, Project ASSIST, and CAN has resulted in a significant increase in articulation activity at the campus level. Most CSU campuses participate in regional articulation consortia to develop and update articulation agreements. The CSU is reviewing its transfer policies and procedures to identify ways to improve existing approaches and develop new ways to increase significantly the number of community college students transferring to universities. This review constitutes a major component of the agenda of the Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, for 1988-89.

"One of the most promising new initiatives undertaken by CSU and CCC began with a joint conference last November which included equal faculty representation from CSU and CCC in English and mathematics. The entire focus of this conference was on ways to improve preparation and articulation in these fundamental areas. Following the conference, an RFP process identified regional approaches which will be jointly funded to address further refinements in articulation, testing and assessment and, most importantly, competency-based agreements concerning English and mathematics curricula between the two segments."

The University of California response

"All campuses of the University of California have organized programs with local community colleges to improve the transfer function. Characteristically these programs involve frequent and regular consultation between UC and community college faculty and administrators regarding student preparation for transfer, articulation of courses and programs between institutions, and enhancement of procedures for admitting and enrolling transfers.

"The programs also involve special efforts to inform students of transfer opportunities and to encourage transfer planning.

"Several University of California programs of this type are long-standing efforts; these include the Davis campus Transfer Opportunity Program, now expanded to colleges throughout northern California, the Los Angeles campus Transfer Alliance Program, which works with colleges throughout the Los Angeles area, the Santa Barbara Transfer Program encompassing colleges in the Santa Barbara and Ventura areas, and the Berkeley campus Cooperative Admissions Program, which is allied with colleges in the San Francisco Bay area. In addition, the San Diego campus this past year instituted the Transfer Admissions Guarantee Program (TAG), the Irvine campus established Zero in On Transfer (ZOT), and the Santa Cruz and Riverside campuses expanded their work with local colleges in parallel programs."

Commission staff comments

Segmental responses to the Commission's recommendation that they encourage their campuses to engage in local or regional, voluntary programs to facilitate transfer and articulation are entirely consistent with the intent of the recommendation. This voluntary direction -- as contrasted with mandated, statewide programs -- makes the best sense given Community College students' tendency to transfer to the nearest University or State University campus. Efforts to facilitate transfer by mandating statewide programs that are not adaptable to individual needs are commendable in their intent but are less cost-effective than voluntary regional efforts. Thus the Commission staff urges that the segments continue to encourage local and regional programs, with an expectation that they will help increasing numbers of Community College students to transfer with ease.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Participation in the California Articulation Number system, which began on a voluntary, regional basis, should be endorsed by the University, the State University, and the Community Colleges in order to encourage its continuing development in all regions and institutions in the State, with increased State funding if necessary.

The Community College response

"The California Community Colleges endorsed the CAN System since the project became a statewide intersegmental project in 1986. Out of the 99 campuses currently participating in the CAN Project, 79 of the campuses are community colleges."

The California State University response

"The Chancellor sent a memorandum to all CSU campus presidents last year endorsing CAN as a system which can facilitate transfer and articulation among postsecondary educational segments and requesting campus participation in the program. The latest CAN progress report indicates a significant increase in both the number of CSU campuses involved in CAN and the number of courses qualified. This year the CSU received funding for a $200,000 budget change proposal which is being used to increase the articulation necessary to qualify courses for CAN. It is our intent to fund staff and support activities at four of our largest transfer-receiving campuses to expand campus use of CAN and to support timely information dissemination about articulation to feeder community colleges. Ultimately we hope to be able to fund similar articulation offices at all campuses."

The University of California response

"The University of California Academic Council this past year encouraged UC campuses to facilitate the progress of CAN by verifying and/or expanding course articulation agreements. In addition, funding has been allocated to the University's campuses to aid the progress of CAN. Two campuses, Davis and Riv-

erside, are expanding their articulation efforts with community colleges and four-year institutions to qualify courses for CAN. These two University campuses plan to qualify a minimum of 20 courses eachfor the program. Remaining UC campuses will work with the CAN Central Office in verifying existing University/community college course articulation agreements, thereby allowing colleges to qualify their courses for CAN."

Commission staff comments

Segmental responses to the recommendation regarding CAN indicate State-level support for the system, but progress in implementing it has been considerably slower than what Commission staff expected when it recommended CAN to the Legislature in 1984 as the most feasible approach that California higher education might take to a common course-numbering system.

There are two related reasons for the current pace of implementation. First, current procedures and criteria for implementation go beyond what was envisioned by the Commission in that it requires State University-to-University, as well as Community College-to-State University and University course articulation. Second, activities include the development of new course articulation agreements that may be more rigorous than those reached in the past. All of this is expensive and both the University and the State University have requested and received special State funding for CAN activities. The Community Colleges have made no such request to date, although their level of participation to date exceeds that of the other segments.

The Intersegmental Coordinating Council, through its Transfer and Articulation Committee, has assumed oversight responsibility for CAN, which had previously been accountable to no specific agency or organization. Its oversight may facilitate smoother implementation of CAN. Commission staff will continue to monitor the implementation process and will return to the Commission with any supplemental recommendations in future reports.

Faculty roles

RECOMMENDATION 5: Statewide faculty senates should urge faculty groups on their campuses to engage in the same kind of voluntary,cooperative articulation activities as those that characterize the state-level efforts in order to ensure problem-free student flow and good articulation between neighboring institutions.

Commission staff comments

Segmental responses to several Commission recommendations give assurances that this is indeed occurring. There has been some unevenness of participation among the Community College academic senates, however, because of inadequate funding for local senates. A budget change proposal for 1989-90 that the Board of Governors supported recently with a high priority would, if funded, go far to alleviate the problem of funding for all senates to participate in State-level activities.

Admission with advanced standing

RECOMMENDATION 6: The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, in consultation with the Academic Senate, should develop and adopt a statement of recommended secondary-school subject-matter preparation for all students expecting to enroll in a Community College that would include core courses for students planning to seek a baccalaureate degree after completing the lower division.

The University and the State University should develop and distribute a joint statement for use by applicants for admission with advanced standing and their counselors that highlights segmental similarities and differences in course requirements and standards for such applicants, particularly with reference to those who would not have been eligible for freshman admission to these segments on the basis of their high school record.

The Community College response

"A statement of recommended secondary-school subject-matter preparation was developed by the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges and was endorsed by the Board of Governors in January, 1988."

The California State University response

"The CSU prints and distributes several publications that inform prospective transfer students about admission requirements, academic programs offered, and special programs available at the campuses. A revised version of CSU's comprehensive booklet explaining CSU transfer admission requirements, *CSU and You*, will be distributed later this year to all community colleges and prospective transfer applicants. To provide prospective transfers with a more realistic view of the California State University and its unique offerings in postsecondary education, a transfer video, *CSU! What A Difference*, has also been produced. The video features five CSU students who transferred from a community college and explains how they selected the CSU campus and programs that best suited their educational and career goals. Copies were distributed free of charge to all California community colleges.

"Presently staff from CSU and CCC Chancellor's offices are engaged in gathering information for the development of a joint systemwide common form for use in evaluation, transfer credit analysis, advising, and graduation check. We hope to have a draft of this form ready for broad review and consultation in both segments later this year. Such a form would be amenable to computer support and could interface with both CAN and ASSIST.

"We will discuss with the University of California the recommendation to develop and distribute a joint statement on university preparation this year. This particular project is one which we feel would benefit from the attention of the ICC cluster committee on Transfer and Articulation."

The University of California response

"The University prints and distributes a wide variety of materials outlining in detail its admission requirements for advanced standing applicants. These materials are provided to high school and community college counselors and are reviewed and discussed at University Counselor Conferences and at College Night and Transfer Day Programs. The materials are also available upon request to the public at large. Discussions of the possibility of a joint statement with the State University on this subject are planned."

Commission staff comments

There has been considerable progress made in intersegmental attention to clear statements about course preparation. The landscape is constantly changing, however, as evidenced by changes in freshman and advanced standing admissions requirements as well as implementation of CAN and ASSIST. Thus it continues to be a high priority to maintain an intersegmental approach to developing information in these areas for use by counselors and potential transfer students.

RECOMMENDATION 7: Options offered freshman applicants to the University and the State University who cannot be admitted to the campus to which they applied because of enrollment limitations should include doing their lower-division work in a Community College with assurance of priority in being admitted to the junior level upon satisfactory completion of lower-division course work. The segments should also consider adopting the practice of joint admission to both a Community College and a University or State University campus for students who are eligible for both as freshmen, with opportunity to transfer as juniors also assured.

The California State University response

"The CSU Admission Advisory Council recently reiterated the commitment of the CSU to give priority to community college students transferring to campuses of the CSU. In its report to the Chancellor the Council states that 'It has always been the policy of the California State University to assign admissions and enrollment planning priority to California Community College transfers who have successfully completed the first two years of their baccalaureate program.' The fact that data indicate that over half of CSU graduates in impacted programs are community college transfers was cited by the Council as evidence that this policy is working. The Chancellor has endorsed the Admissions Advisory Council report and has called for increased efforts to increase public awareness of CSU's policy to grant priority status to community college transfers. The following statement will be used in CSU publications directed to the general public:

> The California State University assigns high priority to California Community College transfer students who have completed the first two years of their baccalaureate program, including those applying for impacted programs. In addition, CSU campuses will make every effort to see that California Community College transfer students originally eligible for admission as first-time freshmen are admitted to their first choice CSU campus.

"The practice of joint admission to both a Community College and a State University for students who are eligible for both as freshmen is not necessary given CSU's priority admission status for transfer students. Further, the CSU has been able to accommodate all qualified upper-division transfer applicants."

The University of California response

"Under the University of California's admissions policy, priority consideration for admission of advanced standing applicants is given to upper division junior transfers from California community colleges. Further, all campuses of the University offer the option of community college enrollment to eligible freshman applicants who cannot be accommodated, with assurance that they will be given priority consideration for admission upon satisfactory completion of lower-division work."

Commission staff comments

Both the University and the State University give assurances of priority in admission with advanced standing for Community College students who successfully complete the lower-division portion of their baccalaureate-degree program. The University's statement that all campuses offer the option of Community College enrollment to eligible freshman applicants who cannot be accommodated is especially reassuring and needs to be made better known to high school counselors and college advisers, parents, and those who are weighing college choices for freshman enrollment.

Public confidence in the Community College transfer function has been wavering in recent years because of unstable State funding of the Community Colleges and a perception that qualified Community College students are unable to transfer to the University in particular and into impacted programs generally because of limitations on space and priority given to accommodating freshman applicants. University and State University policies and practices imply confidence in the Community College transfer function and this confidence needs to be communicated effectively to policy and decision makers outside these institutions.

The issue of joint freshman admission was not systematically addressed by the segments and remains a possibility that merits consideration.

RECOMMENDATION 8: The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges should survey the Community Colleges to determine the degree of implementation for Fall 1987 of assessment, identification of transfer students, counseling services related to placement, and follow-up as a necessary step toward full funding of the implementation of these services by the Governor and the Legislature.

The Community College response

"The community colleges are being asked to report the progress made in the first year implementation (i.e., 1987-1988) of matriculation. This progress report will include information about the extent of implementation of assessment, identification of transfer students, counseling, and follow-up."

Commission staff comments

The Governor and the Legislature have now funded the full first- and second-year implementation of matriculation activities in the Community Colleges at the level requested by the Chancellor's Office. As noted by staff in that office, progress reports on first-year implementation are now being prepared by the colleges.

Given the primacy of the transfer function that Assembly Bill 1725 affirmed, the Commission again urges that the Chancellor's Office give particular attention in its evaluation of the impact of matriculation on services to potential transfer students, including identification of them, assessment of their readiness to do baccalaureate-level work, counseling and remediation when necessary, and advisement about both opportunities and requirements for trans-

fer. The staff also suggests that the Chancellor's Office make plans to quantify this impact in terms of increased numbers of students who transfer to the University and the State University, particularly those of Black and Hispanic origin.

Data bases and information systems

RECOMMENDATION 9: . . . the Community College Chancellor's Office staff should work with administrators in the University and the State University to develop a plan for reporting to them on a regular basis the number of Community College students planning to transfer, especially to impacted campuses and majors.

The Community College response

"Student, course, and course outcome data are the highest priority for the development of the Management Information System and was piloted in 1987-88. Unfortunately, full implementation of the course and student components was not funded for 1988-1989 and therefore the community colleges still do not have the capability to provide this information. However, if the Chancellor's Office had the capability to produce this data, because of the cost and workload involved in implementing this recommendation, the Chancellor's Office would question the wisdom of compiling this data unless the University and the State University demonstrate how they would utilize the data."

Commission staff comments

In making its recommendations, the Commission assumed that this kind of information about potential transfer students would be generated in connection with matriculation procedures, rather than through the Management Information System. Since funding for matriculation includes money for computerizing student data, the Commission suggests that the Chancellor's Office look at the feasibility of using student data obtained as part of matriculation to implement this recommendation.

The need for such information continues to be significant because of the importance of undergraduate enrollment planning by the University and the State University -- to accommodate both new freshmen and Community College transfer students who are eligible and want to enroll at a particular time. High school data are used regularly to project and plan freshman enrollments but, because of the changing size and nature of the Community College student body, planning to accommodate transfer students is much more difficult. The 12.5 percent increase in Community College students who transferred to the University for the Fall 1987 term offers an example of the problem: Is this unusually large increase a one-time phenomenon that resulted from changes in University admission practices which created a backlog of potential applicants, or will demand remain at this same high level or even increase?

RECOMMENDATION 9 (continued): Because of continuing uncertainties about the admission of transfer applicants, the University and the State University should develop a similar system of reporting to each Community College annually on the disposition of applicants for admission with advanced standing from each college, to include information about numbers of applications (1) initiated, (2) completed, (3) acted on favorably, (4) rejected as ineligible, (5) denied for lack of space, (6) admitted but not enrolled, (7) admitted and enrolled, and (8) referred to another campus....

The California State University response

"We concur that such information would be helpful for transfer enrollment planning. The CSU has developed a data base which contains the information specified in the recommendation. The CSU will confer with the University of California to establish common definitions, reporting format, and to determine the feasibility of providing the recommended information to each community college."

The University of California response

"The number of elements of information collected from all applications for admission to the University was recently expanded to include the items recommended above. Discussions are now underway to determine appropriate vehicles for distributing this

information. Systematic distribution to all colleges, along with the follow-up work such reports require, would need funding which is not immediately available."

Commission staff comments

The responses that the University and the State University made to this recommendation are very encouraging. It now appears that the segments are ready to move ahead with joint planning as outlined in the State University's response. Such planning should include both (1) short-term strategies for routine reporting that can be done without special funding and (2) a longer-term proposal to include follow-up activities that might require special funding.

No estimate can now be made of the amount or nature of the "slippage" in Community College transfer -- for example, potential transfers who are ineligible solely on the basis of incomplete applications (usually missing transcripts) and applicants who are admitted but do not enroll. Given such information, Community Colleges should be able to increase the number of successful applications for transfer that their students make.

RECOMMENDATION 10: The University and the State University, in consultation with the Community Colleges and the Commission, should design and execute a longitudinal study of Community College transfer students to obtain information about their lower-division course work and its applicability to various baccalaureate-degree requirements, student choices of campus and major, academic performance before and after transfer, persistence to the degree, and related matters pertaining to the question of how well the colleges are preparing students for transfer.

The California State University response

"The CSU conducts periodic persistence and time-to-degree studies which provide information on native and transfer students. A longitudinal study that analyzes lower-division course work and its applicability to degree requirements would require considerable effort and resources. Given current fiscal limitations, the feasibility of such a study depends on the availability of adequate resources. Since this undertaking is of considerable magnitude, we are also suggesting that a thorough review of the dimensions of such a study, its uses, and the costs involved be placed on the 1988-89 agenda of the ICC cluster on Transfer and Articulation."

The University of California response

"The University recently organized a longitudinal data system tracing, among many other items, student academic performance and persistence to degree. This system includes data for all University undergraduates enrolled. Initial persistence and performance reports drawing upon this system are now in preparation. While the University supports extension of this system to include academic work completed prior to UC enrollment and related items, funds for this project are at present unavailable."

Commission staff comments

The University's and the State University's responses regarding the increasing availability of persistence and performance data are encouraging, and Commission staff will draw on them in its future work. The Commission recently submitted a budget change proposal for 1989-90 for funds to study the transcripts of students who have successfully transferred to a California four-year college or university. If funded, the study will analyze the transcripts of samples of Community College transfer students in comparsion to native students in order to describe and quantify articulation problems that result in the accumulation of extra credit at various levels and unsatisfactory performance after transfer in certain courses and majors.

RECOMMENDATION 11: Segmental review of proposals for new programs leading to an associate or baccalaureate degree should require that the campus making the proposal indicate the program's potential for articulation and any efforts that have been made to work out such articulation agreements with other institutions. Furthermore, the University and the State University should review any future proposals for changes in transfer and articulation policies to see if they would limit or foreclose transfer options that are now available to Community Col-

lege students in occupational and technical programs.

The Community College response

"The Community Colleges are currently required as part of the statewide course and program approval process to indicate how a new program will articulate with a four-year institution."

The California State University response

"The CSU academic review process routinely includes analysis of how the proposal program relates to similar curricula in other higher education segments in California. The review process specifically requires campuses to provide information on how the proposed program articulates with community college programs. (Please see item 1j of the degree proposal form included as Appendix A.)

"With respect to the second part of the recommendation, it is CSU practice to analyze carefully the consequences of proposed changes in transfer and articulation policies, including such issues as lower division prerequisites for impacted majors, to ensure that they do not impede the expeditious intersegmental transfer of students."

The University of California response

"The University's process of reviewing proposals for new academic programs requires assessment of program impact and potential for a variety of constituencies, including transfer students. As a consequence, the process also assumes review of program potential for articulation.

"Regarding point two of this recommendation, the University plans to consider future proposals for changes in transfer and articulation policies in light of the special circumstances of community college students in occupational and technical programs."

Commission staff comments

Segmental responses to this recommendation state that they now perform the recommended program review processes relating to articulation and transfer.

Commission staff calls attention to a promising development in this area of program articulation in the funding by the Governor and the Legislature in 1988-89 of pilot articulated career education programs leading to a baccalaureate degree (2+2+2) in accordance with the Commission's recommendations a year ago. Proposals for such programs are now being submitted to the Community College Chancellor's Office for review, and Commission staff will make a progress report on this project at the January 1989 meeting.

3 Conclusions

Conclusions regarding the universities

The responses that the University and the State University made to the question of how they have been implementing the Commission's recommendations indicate that they are for the most part moving in directions, cooperatively, and at a pace that is in full accordance with the Commission's intent in making those recommendations a year ago. Most encouraging are the responses that indicate that:

- Both the University and the State University have data systems that can be used to increase and improve information about potential transfer students, in order to help Community Colleges do a better job of getting their students not only prepared for, but actually admitted to and enrolled in the universities.
- Campus practices and programs are implementing University and State University policies on transfer that give assurance that all possible efforts are being made to accommodate eligible transfer applicants from the Community Colleges.

Recent increases in the number of Community College transfer students -- particularly to the University -- support the second point in the conclusion that campuses are now making statewide transfer policies work better than in the past. All of this is consonant with Commission recommendations that call for broad State-level policy direction, with regional and local responsibility for making the transfer function work.

Progress in implementing the California Articulation Number (CAN) system has been less deliberate -- particularly on the part of the University -- than Commission staff had hoped, but University and State University responses to the Commission's recommendation on CAN indicate good-faith actions by both systems. Staff has observed that one likely reason for CAN's slow pace is that CAN has become much more than the simple tool for assigning articulation numbers to Community College courses that was intended when staff recommended it to the Legislature -- that is, Community College courses that could be taken in lieu of University and State University courses to satisfy lower-division requirements would have the same CAN numbers. Now, under CAN staff direction, the numbering system has become a process for reaching the course articulation agreements on which the success of CAN rests, and which must precede the assignment of numbers.

Conclusions regarding the Community Colleges

Progress in taking action on the Commission's recommendations has been generally slow and in some instances static in the Community Colleges because of funding problems and a certain amount of uncertainty about the Community College mission in regard to the primacy of the transfer function before Assembly Bill 1725 became law. Now funding is becoming available for many critical aspects of transfer, and the Commission went on record in September in support of the funding of the management information system as a high priority in the Board of Governors' budget.

An observation based on the Community College response to its recommendations is a need to relate transfer concerns and matriculation outcomes. In the absence of a management information system that may take years to implement, the opportunity exists in the implementation of the matriculation program to obtain information that would improve enrollment planning for transfer.

Conclusions regarding the Governor and the Legislature

Actions taken by the Governor and the Legislature regarding transfer and articulation during the past year have been consistent with the Commission's recommendations that they give broad policy direc-

tion to the segments, rather than mandate specific action while asking for accountability from the segments between which students transfer.

Furthermore, the Governor and the Legislature have continued to provide funds for special programs to improve transfer and articulation during a time of budgetary reductions. Adequate funding has not yet been secured for all transfer programs, but this is only a part of the larger issue of funding Community Colleges overall.

Conclusions regarding other groups

Intersegmental Coordinating Council

The Intersegmental Coordinating Council is now operational with an executive director and staff, and four cluster committees that include one on Transfer and Articulation and others in the related areas of Curriculum and Assessment, and Student Outreach and Preparation. Their agendas for 1988-89 are ambitious, and the Commission staff will monitor their work with interest.

Faculty

Faculty participation from all segments in transfer and articulation activities has been good at the statewide and local levels. Formally organized activities include CAN, the Intersegmental Coordinating Council and its cluster committees -- that also include secondary school personnel, and specially funded joint instructionally related projects such as the common core transfer curriculum.

Emerging issues

Finally, two new issues -- the common core transfer curriculum, and the jointly awarded associate in arts degree -- warrant mention here.

The common core curriculum

The recently enacted Community College reform legislation called for the development and implementation of a common core transfer curriculum. Work is now underway by faculty senates to this end, as illustrated by the materials from the University of California, the California State University, and the Community Colleges reproduced as Appendix B.

There appears to be widespread, rather uncritical support for a common core curriculum to facilitate transfer with junior standing by overcoming the problem of differing general education requirements between the university systems and among the campuses.

The Commission is interested in the progress of the common core curriculum, and staff will participate in discussions regarding it through the Intersegmental Coordinating Council and elsewhere. Many believe that the common core curriculum will be most helpful to those Community College students who are transfer-bound and know themselves to be so at the time of initial enrollment. There is some concern, however, that the many students who have multiple objectives that include but also go beyond transfer will not be the immediate beneficiaries of the core curriculum. This latter group is likely to include the majority of Community College students, many of whom are students of color. It will be important to ensure that attention to the core curriculum not diminish attention to the curricular needs of students who have multiple educational objectives. Continued support to the counseling and placement functions through the matriculation process will help ensure that this does not occur. It will also be important to assess the progress of students from the point of transfer through to the baccalaureate and to monitor that progress by ethnic group.

A jointly awarded associate degree

Among the recent developments that appear promising for increasing the flow of Community College transfer students is the possibility of establishing an associate in arts degree that could be jointly awarded by participating universities and Community Colleges. It seems likely that jointly awarded associate degrees could increase and facilitate the flow of transfer students by developing in them a close identity with a university campus. The joint associate degree might also elevate the perceived status of participating Community Colleges by parents and

advisers of high school students. The Commission is therefore interested in encouraging continued discussion about the possibilities of such degrees between both public and private universities and Community Colleges.

Appendix A

California State University
Procedures for Submitting Proposals
for New Degree Major Programs

Procedure for Submitting Proposals for New Degree Major Programs*

A campus, in accordance with its approved academic master plan, submits detailed proposals for new degree major programs to the Division of Educational Programs and Resources for review and approval in the academic year preceding projected implementation. Approval of any degree major program is subject to campus assurances that financial support, qualified faculty, physical facilities and library holdings sufficient to establish and maintain the program will be available within current budgetary support levels. The proposal must follow the format below, and six copies should be sent to the Division of Educational Programs and Resources, Office of the Chancellor.

1. Definition of the Proposed Degree Major Program

   a. Name of the campus submitting the request, the full and exact designation (degree terminology) for the proposed degree major program, and academic year of intended implementation.

   b. Name of the department, departments, division or other unit of the campus which would offer the proposed degree major program. Identify the unit which will have primary responsibility.

   c. Name, title, and rank of the individual(s) primarily responsible for drafting the proposed degree major program.

   d. Objectives of the proposed degree major program.

   e. Total number of units required for the major. List of all courses, by catalog number, title, and units of credit, to be specifically required for a major under the proposed degree program. Identify those new courses which are 1) needed to initiate the program and 2) needed during the first two years after implementation. Include proposed catalog description of all new courses.

   f. List of elective courses, by catalog number, title, and units of credit, which can be used to satisfy requirements for the major. Identify those new courses which are 1) needed to initiate the program and 2) needed during the first two years after implementation. Include proposed catalog description of all new courses.

      (Note: With regard to e. and f., a proposed program should take advantage of courses already offered in other departments when subject matter would otherwise overlap or duplicate existing course content.)

   g. If any formal options, concentration, or special emphases are planned under the proposed major, explain fully.

   h. Course prerequisites and other criteria for admission of students to the proposed degree major program, and for their continuation in it.

   i. Explanation of special characteristics of the proposed degree major program, e.g., in terminology, units of credit required, types of course work, etc.

   j. For undergraduate programs, provisions for articulation of the proposed major with community college programs.

*Revised March 1985

k. Provision for meeting accreditation requirements, where applicable, and anticipated date of accreditation request.

(Note: Where applicable, establishment of a master's degree program should be preceded by national professional accreditation of the corresponding bachelor's degree major program.)

2. Need for the Proposed Degree Major Program

a. List of other California State University campuses currently offering or projecting the proposed degree major program; list of neighboring institutions, public and private, currently offering the proposed degree major program.

b. Differences between the proposed program and programs listed in a. above.

c. List of other curricula currently offered by the campus which are closely related to the proposed program. Enrollment figures during the past three years in specified courses or programs closely related to the proposed degree major program. If a formal minor, option or concentration is offered in the proposed subject area, indicate the number of students enrolled.

d. Results of a formal survey in the geographical area to be served indicating demand for individuals who have earned the proposed degree *and* evidence of serious student interest in majoring in the proposed program. Justify any discrepancies between national/statewide/professional manpower surveys and local findings.

e. For graduate programs, the number of declared undergraduate majors and the degree production over the preceding three years for the corresponding baccalaureate program.

f. Professional uses of the proposed degree major program.

g. The expected number of majors in the year of initiation and three years and five years thereafter. The expected number of graduates in the year of initiation and three years and five years thereafter.

(Note: This degree major program will be subject to program review evaluation within five years after implementation.)

3. Existing Support Resources for the Proposed Degree Major Program

(Note: Sections 3 and 4 and Table I should be prepared in consultation with the campus administrators responsible for faculty staffing and instructional facilities allocation and planning.)

a. Faculty members, with rank, appointment status, highest degree earned, date and field of highest degree, and professional experience (including publications if the proposal is for a graduate degree), who would teach in the proposed program.

(Note: For proposed graduate degree programs, a minimum of five full-time faculty members with the terminal professional degree should be on the program staff.)

b. Space and facilities that would be used in support of the proposed program. Show how this space is currently used and what alternate arrangements, if any, will be made for the current occupants.

c. Library resources to support the program, specified by subject areas, volume count, periodical holdings, etc.

d. Equipment and other specialized materials currently available.

4. Additional Support Resources Required

(Note: If additional support resources will be needed to implement and maintain the program, a statement by the responsible administrator(s) should be attached to the proposal assuring that such resources will be provided.)

a. Complete Table I, enrollment and faculty positions should be shown for all discipline categories which will increase because of the new program and for all discipline categories which will decrease because of the new program. If faculty positions are to be transferred into the new program from other areas, the reductions in faculty positions should be shown in the appropriate discipline category.

b. Any special characteristics of the additional faculty or staff support positions needed to implement the proposed program.

c. The amount of additional lecture and/or laboratory space required to initiate and sustain the program over the next five years. Indicate any additional special facilities that will be required. If the space is under construction, what is the projected occupancy date? If the space is planned, indicate campuswide priority of the facility, capital outlay program priority, and projected date of occupancy.

d. Additional library resources needed. Indicate the commitment of the campus to purchase or borrow through inter-library loan these additional resources.

e. Additional equipment or specialized materials that will be 1) needed to implement the program and 2) needed during the first two years after initiation. Indicate source of funds and priority to secure these resource needs.

5. Abstract of the Proposal and Proposed Catalog Description

Attach an abstract of the foregoing proposal, not to exceed two pages, and a complete proposed catalog description, including admission and degree requirements.

TABLE I.
Projected Campus Total Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) and Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) Attributable to the Proposed Degree Program

(This table should be prepared by the campus administrators responsible for faculty staffing and instructional facilities allocation and planning.)

DISCIPLINE CATEGORY* Note: Campus schools and departments may be substituted for HEGIS categories in this column.	YEAR OF INITIATION				3 YEARS THEREAFTER				5 YEARS THEREAFTER			
	Without the Program		With the Program		Without the Program		With the Program		Without the Program		With the Program	
	FTES	FTEF	FTES	FTEF	FTES	FTEF	FTES	FTEF	FTES	FTEF	FTES	FTEF
Agriculture and Natural Resources												
Architecture and Environmental Design												
Area Studies												
Biological Sciences												
Business and Management												
Communications												
Computer and Information Sciences												
Education												
Physical Education												
Industrial Education												
Engineering												
Fine and Applied Arts												
Foreign Languages												
Health Professions												
Nursing												
Home Economics												
Letters												
Library Science												
Mathematics												
Military Science												
Physical Sciences												
Psychology												
Public Affairs and Services												
Social Sciences												
Interdisciplinary Studies												
Campus Total												

Approved University Enrollment Allocation

Approved University Enrollment Allocation

Approved University Enrollment Allocation

*HEGIS categories as modified for faculty staffing

Appendix B

Transfer Core Curriculum Statement, University of California Universitywide Academic Senate Asembly 25

Excerpt from the Minutes of the California State University Academic Senate, September 6, 1988 29

Letter from Karen Sue Grosz, President of the California Community Colleges Academic Senate and Ronn Farland, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs of the California Community Colleges to the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, July 25, 1988 31

University of California

Transfer Core Curriculum

At the University of California's Universitywide Academic Senate Assembly meeting on May 5, 1988, the Assembly approved a Transfer Core Curriculum policy applicable to all transfer students. The policy specifies a series of subject areas and types of courses which, if completed prior to transfer, will satisfy the lower division Breadth and General Education (B/GE) requirements at any general campus of the University.
The basic policy for the Transfer Core Curriculum is as follows:

a. Prior to transfer, students have the option of completing the Transfer Core Curriculum to satisfy the lower division B/GE requirements at any campus of the University or of fulfilling the specific lower division B/GE requirements of the school or college of the campus to which they will transfer.

b. Students who have not completed the Transfer Core Curriculum prior to transfer will be required to satisfy the specific B/GE requirements of the school or college of the campus to which they transfer.

BACKGROUND

It is the Academic Senate's conviction that the implementation of the Transfer Curriculum will facilitate the transfer of qualified students to the University, by providing students with a clear set of requirements to be fulfilled and a framework of fundamental subject areas within which to pursue an academic program at a community college or other college.

The Transfer Curriculum is not designed to supplant existing admissions standards for transfer students. Students will still be required to present a specified grade point average on their college courses and/or remedy any existing subject omissions in their high school work. Also, the Transfer Curriculum will not affect prerequisites for various majors, or other upper division courses required by the campuses. Prerequisites and other requirements outside the Transfer Curriculum will continue to be campus and program specific.

The first draft of a Transfer Curriculum was developed by the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), and introduced to the Academic Council in the spring of 1987. Following that meeting, the draft was sent to the campuses for review. At the same time, members of UCEP, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), and the Academic Council initiated work on the development of a statewide transfer core curriculum with the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, comprising the Academic Senate leadership of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California. The hope of the Intersegmental Committee was to unify the

University draft on the transfer core and the existing State University systemwide General Education Requirements into a commom transfer core curriculum that would be applicable to both the University and the State University. Although the Intersegmental Committee came very close to an agreement on a common core, small differences still existed which could not be resolved prior to the adoption of the University Transfer Core Curriculum. The University Senate leadership decided to go ahead with the implementation of the University version of the Transfer Core Curriculum. At the same time, the Senate expressed its firm commitment to continue its work with the State University and the Community Colleges in resolving existing differences and in developing a single transfer core applicable to both the State University and the University.

IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

The Universitywide Transfer Core Curriculum policy is effective immediately. BOARS has been charged with the responsibility to develop articulation agreements with the Community Colleges regarding courses that can be applied to the Transfer Curriculum. This process is expected to be completed within a year. In the meantime, campuses have been instructed to make decisions on applicable courses until BOARS completes its work.

(Attachment)

TRANSFER CORE CURRICULUM

Beginning with applicants to the fall term 1989, transfer students may fulfill the lower division breadth and general education requirements by completing the Transfer Core Curriculum. The Transfer Core Curriculum consists of a series of subject areas and types of courses which, if completed prior to transfer, will satisfy the breadth and general education requirements at any campus of the University of California. You have the option, however, to fulfill the breadth and general education requirements by either completing the Transfer Core Curriculum or the specific lower division breadth and general education requirements of the school or college of the campus to which you intend to transfer.

If you do not complete the breadth and general education requirements or the Transfer Core Curriculum before transferring to the University, you will be subject to the regulations regarding breadth and general education requirements of the school or college of the campus to which you have been admitted.

Staff in the Admissions or Relations with Schools Office at the campus you wish to transfer will help you with questions relating to the Transfer Core Curriculum.

SUBJECT AREA	TERMS REQUIRED	UNITS REQUIRED
1. Foreign Language	Proficiency	Proficiency
2. English Composition	2 semesters or 3 quarters	6 semester units
3. Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning	1 semester or 2 quarters	3 semester units
4. Arts and Humanities	3 semesters or 4 quarters	9 semester units
5. Social and Behavioral Sciences	3 semesters or 4 quarters	9 semester units
6. Physical and/or Biological Sciences	2 semesters or 3 quarters	7 semester units
Total	11 semesters or 16 quarters	34 semester units

1. **FOREIGN LANGUAGE:** This requirement may be fulfilled by completion of two years of a foreign language in high school with a grade of C or better, or equivalent proficiency demonstrated by college courses or performance on tests, such as earning a minimum score of 550 on an appropriate College Board Achievement Test in a foreign language.

2. **ENGLISH COMPOSITION:** The English Composition requirement must be fulfilled by completion of a one-year lower division English composition sequence. Courses designed exclusively for satisfaction of remedial composition cannot be counted toward fulfillment of this requirement.

3. **MATHEMATICS/QUANTITATIVE REASONING:** One-semester or two-quarter courses in mathematics or mathematical statistics. This requirement may be fulfilled by earning a minimum score of 600 on the Mathematics section of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), or 550 on the College Board Achievement Test in Mathematics (Level I or Level II). Courses on the application of statistics to particular disciplines may not be used to fulfill this requirement.

   Courses taken to fulfill the breadth/general education requirements in the subject areas that follow, Arts and Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Physical and/or Biological Sciences, should provide a broad foundation for understanding and learning to think critically, write, and speak about the biological and physical world and the most important features and accomplishments of civilization. In addition to knowledge and appreciation, courses should stress principles and concepts that unify knowledge as well as the methods of investigation that characterize specific disciplines. The following descriptions are examples of the types of courses that could be used to meet these requirements.

4. **ARTS AND HUMANITIES:** Courses in drama, music, dance or the visual arts, history, literature, classical studies, religion, and philosophy may fulfill this requirement. At least one course must be in the arts and one in the humanities. Courses in the arts may include performance or studio components; however, courses that are primarily performance or studio art courses cannot be used to satisfy this requirement.

5. **SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES:** Courses in anthropology, economics, ethnic studies, political sciences, psychology, sociology, or from an interdisciplinary social science sequence.

6. **PHYSICAL AND/OR BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES:** Courses in general biology, general chemistry, basic physics, or physical sciences (with the exception of mathematics). At least one of the courses must include a laboratory.

EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE, SEPTEMBER 6, 1988

Perhaps the most challenging task facing the Senate this year is achievement of agreement on the language of the General Education Transfer Curriculum that will be a significant responsibility of the General Education-Breadth Advisory Committee and I am certain that Nancy Carmichael, the new Chair of that committee, will appreciate all the help you can give, particularly in terms of working with your campus senates. The Joint Legislative Committee has proposed as January 1, 1989, deadline for completion and implementation of the transfer curriculum, but we have succeeded in getting agreement to move that date to year's end. However, to assure full consultation of all the campus senates on the final language, I believe we must have all campus recommendation sent to the Academic Affairs committee of the Statewide Academic Senate (Hall Charnofsky is its chair) no later than the beginning of January, 1989. Your help in meeting this time schedule will be greatly appreciated.

In the meantime, pursuant to the senate resolution of last May, the Executive Committee will continue to work with the faculty of the other segments to achieve additional areas of intersegmental agreement.

California Community Colleges

July 25, 1988

To: Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates

From: Karen Sue Grosz, President, Academic Senate
Ronn Farland, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

On May 31, representatives from the Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges met in order to assess the results of an extensive field consultation regarding the draft of the general education transfer curriculum proposal. We agreed at this meeting that we would submit to you the following recommendations for consideration in the revision of the draft proposal. We believe that these recommendations will strengthen the proposed transfer curriculum, and thus will be of greater benefit to community college transfer students.

1. There is a need for greater uniformity and consistency among receiving campuses in the interpretation and application of regulations regarding the "double counting" of some courses for both general education and academic major requirements, as well as general education and state education code requirements

2. Critical thinking need not be required as a separate course in the general education curriculum, but critical thinking skills should be developed in courses throughout the curriculum.

3. We support the elimination of the separate course requirement for critical thinking in order to allow the transfer curriculum to include two semesters of English composition and one semester of oral communication as requirements.

4. The proposed general education curriculum should endorse a foreign language competency requirement which could be fulfilled by the successful completion of two years of high school instruction, or the college equivalent. A uniform definition of the college equivalent of two years of high school in foreign language instruction should be adopted and applied

consistently by the University of California and the California State University systems.

5. Applied statistics should be allowed to fulfill the mathematics/quantitative reasoning requirement, provided that the statistics courses have a prerequisite of at least intermediate algebra.

6. The three segments of public postsecondary education should develop a uniform policy for granting credit for high school advanced placement courses.

We wish to extend our support to the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates for its outstanding efforts in developing an intersegmental general education transfer curriculum. We are aware that the attempt to develop intersegmental consensus on such an important issue is an ambitious undertaking, and we commend you for taking the leadership role in this matter. We hope that our recommendations will be of some value to you in developing a final draft of the transfer curriculum.

Bibliography

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Access in a Broader Context: College-Going Rates in California.* Commission Report 78-14. Sacramento: The Commission, October 1978.

--. *College-Going Rates in California: Fall 1978 Update.* Commission Agenda Item, September 16, 1979.

--. *College-Going Rates in California: 1979 Update.* Commission Report 81-3. Sacramento: The Commission, January 1981.

--. California *College-Going Rates and Community College Transfers, 1980.* Commission Report 82-2. Sacramento: The Commission, January 1982a.

--. Update of *Community College Transfer Student Statistics, June 1982.* Commission Report 82-24. Sacramento: The Commission, June 1982b.

--. Update of *Community College Transfer Student Statistics, Fall 1982.* Commission Report 83-31. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1983.

--. Update of *Community College Transfer Student Statistics, Fall 1983.* Commission Report 84-10. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1984a.

--. *Views from the Field on Community College Transfer: Testimony to the Ad Hoc Committee on Community College Transfer, California Postsecondary Education Commission.* Commission Report 84-20. Sacramento: The Commission, June 1984b.

--. Common Course-Numbering Systems: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 851 of 1983. Commission Report 84-34. Sacramento: The Commission, December 1984c.

--. *Reaffirming California's Commitment to Transfer.* Commission Report 85-15. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1985a.

--. Update of *Community College Transfer Student Statistics, Fall 1984.* Commission Report 85-21. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1985b.

--. Update of *Community College Transfer Student Statistics, Fall 1985.* Commission Report 86-11. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1986.

--. *Transfer, Articulation, and Collaboration Twenty-Five Years Later: A Report of Relationships Between Two- and Four-Year Institutions.* Commission Agenda Item 10, April 27, 1987a.

--. Update of *Community College Transfer Student Statistics, University of California and the California State University, Fall 1986.* Commission Report 87-22. Sacramento: The Commission, April 1987b.

--. *Strengthening Transfer and Articulation Policies and Practices in California's Colleges and Universities: Progress Since 1985 and Suggestions for the Future.* Commission Report 87-41. Sacramento: The Commission, November 1987c.

--. *Improving Student Performance Reporting: Review and Epilogue. The Final Report of the Commission's Project on Transforming Student Academic Performance Data into Useful Information.* Commission Report 87-37, September 1987d.

--. *Articulating Career Education Programs from High School through Community College to the Baccalaureate Degree.* Commission Report 87-48. Sacramento: The Commission, December 1987e.

--. Update of *Community College Transfer Student Statistics, Fall 1987.* Commission Report 88-15. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1988.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of December 1988, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach, *Chairperson*
Henry Der, San Francisco
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles, *Vice Chairperson*
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; appointed by the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University

Borgny Baird, Long Beach; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Kenneth L. Peters, Tarzana; appointed by the California State Board of Education

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by California's independent colleges and universities

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning,

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its interim executive director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514; telephone (916) 445-7933.

Progress in Implementing the Recommendations of the Commission's 1987 Report on Strengthening Transfer and Articulation

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 88-38

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Other recent reports of the Commission include:

88-21 Staff Development in California's Public Schools: Recommendations of the Policy Development Committee for the California Staff Development Policy Study, March 16, 1988 (March 1988)

88-22 and 23 Staff Development in California: Public and Personal Investments, Program Patterns, and Policy Choices, by Judith Warren Little, William H. Gerritz, David S. Stern, James W. Guthrie, Michael W. Kirst, and David D. Marsh. A Joint Publication of Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development • Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), December 1987:

88-22 Executive Summary (March 1988)

88-23 Report (March 1988)

88-24 Status Report on Human Corps Activities: The First in a Series of Five Annual Reports to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 1820 (Chapter 1245, Statutes of 1987) (May 1988)

88-25 Proposed Construction of the Petaluma Center of Santa Rosa Junior College: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request for Capital Funds for Permanent Off-Campus Center in Southern Sonoma County (May 1988)

88-26 California College-Going Rates, 1987 Update: The Eleventh in a Series of Reports on New Freshman Enrollments at California's Colleges and Universities by Recent Graduates of California High Schools (June 1988)

88-27 Proposed Construction of Off-Campus Community College Centers in Western Riverside County: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request of the Riverside and Mt. San Jacinto Community College Districts for Capital Funds to Build Permanent Off-Campus Centers in Norco and Moreno Valley and South of Sun City (June 1988)

88-28 Annual Report on Program Review Activities, 1986-87: The Twelfth in a Series of Reports to the Legislature and the Governor on Program Review by Commission Staff and California's Public Colleges and Universities (June 1988)

88-29 Diversification of the Faculty and Staff in California Public Postsecondary Education from 1977 to 1987: The Fifth in the Commission's Series of Biennial Reports on Equal Employment Opportunity in California's Public Colleges and Universities (September 1988)

88-30 Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1987-88: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation (September 1988)

88-31 The Role of the California Postsecondary Education Commission in Achieving Educational Equity in California: The Report of the Commission's Special Committee on Educational Equity, Cruz Reynoso, *Chair* (September 1988)

88-32 A Comprehensive Student Information System, by John G. Harrison: A Report Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission by the Wyndgate Group, Ltd. (September 1988)

88-33 Appropriations in the 1988-89 State Budget for the Public Segments of Higher Education: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (October 1988)

88-34 Legislation Affecting Higher Education Enacted During the 1987-88 Session: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (October 1988)

88-35 Meeting California's Adult Education Needs: Recommendations to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1988 Budget Act (October 1988)

88-36 Implementing a Comprehensive Student Information System in California: A Recommended Plan of Action (October 1988)

88-37 Proposed Establishment of San Jose State University's Tri-County Center in Salinas: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request by the California State University for Funds to Create an Off-Campus Center to Serve Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz Counties (October 1988)

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges FEB 03 1989